

REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The final Office Action dated January 11, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 4 and 6-9 have been amended and claims 5 and 10 have been canceled. Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,165,487 to *Johnson* (hereinafter "*Johnson*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicant respectfully submits that *Johnson* does not teach every element recited in claim 1. Thus, *Johnson* cannot anticipate claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites, among other features, a "motor shaft comprising a chamfer disposed between the fan and the motor." According to the Office Action, a triangular shaped tongue 45 which is disclosed in *Johnson* is considered to anticipate the chamfer as recited in claim 1. See Office Action at page 2. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. While *Johnson* does in fact disclose a triangular shaped tongue 45, the Applicant submits that a tongue is not a chamfer, in fact, it is just the opposite.

The American Heritage Dictionary defines "chamfer" as "a flat surface made by cutting off the edge of ... a block of ... material." This definition is completely consistent with the description of the chamfer in the specification of the present application, including the corresponding figures. In contrast, the tongue 45, as may be clearly seen in Figure 7 of *Johnson*, is not a flat surface made by cutting off an edge of a block of material. Instead, the tongue 45 is

just the opposite; it is a protrusion which engages an opening 46 to secure the drive shaft to a cover 7. *See e.g.*, page 2, ll. 45-46 and page 3, ll. 42-44. Because the tongue 45 is not structurally or functionally the same or similar to the chamfer, *Johnson* cannot disclose this feature.

In addition, claim 1 recites a motor shaft structure having “a fan coupled to the motor shaft.” *Johnson* does not disclose this feature. While *Johnson* does disclose a fan 85, the reference does not disclose that the fan 85 is coupled to a motor shaft. For at least the reasons set forth above, *Johnson* does not teach each and every element recited in claim 1 and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable for at least the same reasons.

The Office Action also rejected claims 4 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,547,238 to *Tremblay* (hereinafter “*Tremblay*”). The Applicant traverses the rejection. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has not indicated how *Tremblay* anticipates claims 4 and 9 in order to support the rejection. Instead, the Office Action merely provides a conclusory statement. In particular, the Office Action fails to specifically identify even one feature in *Tremblay* which corresponds to any of the recited elements in claims 4 and 9. Thus, the Applicant does not understand how *Tremblay* anticipates these claims. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the finality of the rejection and issue a new rejection specifically pointing out how *Tremblay* anticipates the claims.

With specific regard to claim 4, *Tremblay* does not disclose each and every claim element. More specifically, claim 4 recites a laundry dryer comprising, among other features, a motor shaft which “includes means for cooperating with a tool to prevent the motor shaft from

rotating.” *Tremblay* does not disclose this feature. At most, *Tremblay* teaches a motor 48 having a shaft extension 58 which connects to a shaft extension 106 of a fan 108 with a coupling 112. However, neither the shaft extension 58 nor the shaft extension 106 provide or include a “means for cooperating with a tool to prevent the motor shaft from rotating” as recited in claim 4. Thus, *Tremblay* does not anticipate claim 4 and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Nor does *Tremblay* anticipate claim 9. As noted above, claim 9 has been amended to recite a laundry dryer comprising, among other features, a motor shaft which “includes a chamfer for facilitating removal of the fan from the motor shaft.” *Tremblay* does not disclose this feature. As discussed above, *Tremblay* discloses shaft extensions 58 and 106, neither of which employ “a chamfer for facilitating removal of the fan from the motor shaft.” Therefore, *Tremblay* does not disclose all the features recited in claim 9 and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 5-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tremblay* in view of *Johnson*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with regard to claims 5-8. With regard to claims 5 and 10, the rejection is moot as the Applicant has cancelled claims 5 and 10.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Tremblay* nor *Johnson*, either singularly or in combination, disclose all the elements recited in claims 6-8. As discussed above, *Tremblay* fails to disclose each and every element of claim 4, from which claims 6-8 depend. Similarly, the Applicant submits that *Johnson* fails to address the shortcomings of *Tremblay*. More specifically, *Johnson* fails to disclose a chamfer. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully

Application No.: 10/660,732
Amendment dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated January 11, 2005

Docket No.: 9988.057.00-US

submits that claims 6-8 are patentable over *Tremblay* in view of *Johnson* and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Applicant believes the application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner has any questions regarding this application, the Examiner may call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: April 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Reg. No.} 53,005
for Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Attorney for Applicant

Application No.: 10/660,732
Amendment dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated January 11, 2005



Docket No.: 9988.057.00-US

submits that claims 6-8 are patentable over *Tremblay* in view of *Johnson* and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Applicant believes the application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner has any questions regarding this application, the Examiner may call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: April 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Reg. No.} 53,005
for Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Attorney for Applicant